

REMARKS

This Supplemental Amendment is submitted as a supplement to the Amendment filed on July 7, 2008, which was fully responsive to Office Action dated March 4, 2008 issued in connection with the above-identified application. With this Supplemental Amendment, claims 1, 4 and 8 have been amended; and claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

At the outset, the Applicants thank Examiner Donabed and his supervisor for granting the telephone interview with the Applicants' representative, which was conducted on September 12, 2008. During the telephone interview, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 (i.e., as exemplary independent claim) was discussed in detail. Additionally, the distinguishable features between the present invention and the cited prior art were also discussed.

Specifically, it was noted that the present application (as recited in claim 1) uses two kinds of information (i.e., common state information and individual state information) for managing and controlling format engines. The common state information is common to all format engines, wherein the individual state information has a format and content that is different for each format engine.

It was noted, however, that Takahashi discloses controlling the on and off state of a multimedia device using a multimedia controller; and a multimedia device that includes a software object which is a resident multimedia controller for performing management of the entire multimedia device. Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest the claimed common state and individual state information, let alone correspondence between common states and individual states which define the outputting of each format engine in a representation different for each format engine; and controlling the operation of the format engines such that each engine is in an arbitrary individual state.

At the conclusion of the telephone interview, it was suggested that independent claims 1 and 8 be amended to incorporate the features of dependent claim 3. Examiner Donabed and his supervisor indicated that such an amendment to the independent claims would likely overcome

the prior art rejections in the outstanding Office Action.

Accordingly, this Supplemental Amendment is submitted as a result of the agreement reached with Examiner Donabed and his supervisor (i.e., during the telephone interview conducted on September 12, 2008) with regard to amending the independent claims. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 8 have been similarly amended to incorporate the features of dependent claim 3. For example, claim 1 (as amended) recites the following features:

“[a]n information processing apparatus storing a plurality of format engines each for executing data described in a different format, the information processing apparatus comprising:

format engine managing means for pre-defining common states which define operating states of each format engine in a representation common to all the format engines, and managing an operation of each format engine;

individual state obtaining means, provided in correspondence with each format engine, for obtaining an individual state of each format engine and sending common state information indicating the common state corresponding to the obtained individual state to the format engine managing means; and

operation control means, provided in correspondence with each format engine, for pre-defining a correspondence between the common states and individual states which define the operating states of each format engine in a representation different for each format engine, and controlling operations of the format engines such that each format engine is in an arbitrary individual state;

wherein for changing a format engine to a predetermined common state, the format engine managing means sends a message including common state information indicating the predetermined common state to the operation control means provided in correspondence with the format engine, and when the message is sent from the format engine managing means, the operation control means controls the format engine such that the format engine is in the individual state corresponding to the common state indicated by the common state information included in the message; and

wherein the format engine managing means manages an operation of each format engine

based on the common state indicated by the common state information which is outputted from the individual state obtaining means.” (Emphasis added).

The features noted above in claim 1 are recited in independent claim 8 (as amended). Additionally, the features noted above are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure.

As noted above, Examiner Donabed and his supervisor indicated (i.e., during the telephone interview conducted on September 12, 2008) that the above amendments would likely overcome the prior art rejections in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 8 (as amended) should be distinguished over the cited prior without additional comment being necessary. Likewise, dependent claims 2-7 and 9 are also believed to be distinguished over the cited prior art at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action dated March 4, 2008, and pass the present application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuki HORII et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2008.09.25 15:45:13 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 25, 2008